

Results of the Lake Michigan Mass Balance Project: Polychlorinated Biphenyls Modeling Report

Prepared for

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Great Lakes National Program Office
77 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Prepared by

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory
Mid-Continent Ecology Division
Large Lakes and Rivers Forecasting Research Branch
Large Lakes Research Station
9311 Groh Road
Grosse Ile, Michigan 48138

Ronald Rossmann, Editor



Notice

The information in this document has been obtained primarily through funding by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) under the auspices of the Office of Research and Development (ORD) and by the Great Lakes National Program Office (GLNPO). The report has been subjected to the Agency's peer and administrative review and it has been approved for publication as a USEPA document. Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

Foreword

The Lake Michigan Mass Balance Project (LMMBP) was initiated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Great Lakes National Program Office (GLNPO) to determine strategies for managing and remediating toxic chemicals in the lake basin. Within the ecosystem approach, the mass balance framework is considered the best means of accomplishing this objective, and GLNPO requested the assistance of the USEPA Office of Research and Development (ORD) to facilitate and produce mathematical models that account for the sources, sinks, transport, fate, and food chain bioaccumulation of certain chemicals. This approach has been used in the past and builds upon the modeling efforts that have occurred in the Assessment and Remediation of Contaminated Sediments (ARCS) Program and the lower Fox River/Green Bay Mass Balance Project. The feasibility of such studies and resultant alternative management options for contaminants in large rivers and a large embayment were demonstrated, and a logical extension to the entire Lake Michigan receiving water body and major tributaries was warranted. There were a large number of cooperators in this project, and by focusing Federal, State, local, private, and academic efforts and resources on a common goal, much more was accomplished than if these entities acted independently.

The project was conducted in conjunction with the Enhanced Monitoring Program and the approach required that all monitoring and field research be coordinated and common methodologies used. Mathematical modelers were consulted during planning for sample design, parameters, and temporal and spatial sampling considerations. The product was then a consistent and reliable database of information that was accessible by project participants and the public. Data for the LMMBP were collected primarily during 1994 and 1995 and have been compiled according to specified quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) requirements, and other data assessments have been made for modeling purposes.

The need to consider the environmental benefits and consequences of alternative remediation choices to protect and improve our environment continues to intensify as: 1) environmental problems become more complex; 2) the means to address and investigate problems become more technical, time-consuming, and expensive; and 3) the actual costs to implement action strategies has escalated. The integrated PCBs mass balance modeling results are presented in this document and can aid managers in establishing priorities for both lake-wide and local improvements. The forecasting of PCB concentrations in top predator fish is one of the primary endpoints of this investigation as it relates to both ecosystem and human health. The capability of forecast modeling presented here is a salient feature of this approach directed toward providing multiple alternatives, which then can be examined through benefit-cost analyses.

This report presents the current status and results of the PCB modeling effort through the summer of 2006. Within this document some recommendations have been provided for potential future work with the models. Of course, a model and modeling applications are never complete, and it is expected that further efforts will change some results, insights, and our understanding of Lake Michigan. These efforts require an investment of resources and time, and improvements with additional model run executions are measured in years. In the larger picture, the need for Agency modeling technologies continues to intensify and the requirement for

reduced uncertainty will lead to future improved generations of models. We have put great emphasis on following guidance provided by the USEPA and other agencies in assuring that the scientific theory is implemented accurately and completely by model computer code and that best modeling practices have been instituted. We also submitted this to scientific peer review using an interdisciplinary panel of scientists and experts that reviewed model theory and application which evolve on a continuing basis. The purpose is to ensure that decisions based on the modeling efforts are reliable and scientifically credible.

This document is not intended to include all of the details and background required to understand the entire LMMBP. Rather the reader should refer to the LMMBP Work Plan and other materials on the GLNPO web site and the Lake Michigan Mass Balance Modeling Quality Assurance Plan on the ORD-Grosse Ile web site for further information.

This document includes replies to peer reviewer comments made during a peer review conducted 27-28 July 2004 in Romulus, Michigan. These replies and the original peer review comments are found in Part 7.

Abstract

The Lake Michigan Mass Balance Project (LMMBP) was conducted to measure and model nutrients, atrazine, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), *trans*-nonachlor, and mercury to gain a better understanding of the sources, sinks, transport, fate, and effects of these substances within the system and to aid managers in the environmental decision-making process for the Lake Michigan Basin. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Office of Research and Development (ORD) was requested to conduct and facilitate modeling in cooperation with the USEPA Region V; the USEPA Great Lakes National Program Office (GLNPO); other Federal agencies; the States of Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana; the Tribes; and the public and private sectors. The effort was supported by intensive sampling of the atmosphere, major tributaries, sediments, water column, and biota during the 1994-1995 field years as well as by extensive quality assurance and database development. Multimedia, mass balance modeling frameworks were applied to examine primary source and loss categories and make various model forecasts for a variety of loading scenarios. This report focuses on the modeling practices applied and results for PCBs from the MICHTOX screening-level model and the higher-resolution LM2-Toxic and LM Food Chain models. A unique aspect of this work is the modeling of PCBs on a congener-level basis to make predictions of total PCBs in the system.

Results of the system mass balance show that the greatest, external gross input of PCBs to the system is atmospheric vapor phase absorption followed by tributary inputs and atmospheric deposition, respectively. The greatest gross losses from the system are volatilization and deep burial in sediments. Internal PCBs loading from sediment resuspension is substantial. Gross PCBs inputs to, losses from, and cycling processes within the system each typically exceed 1000 kg/year. Tributary inputs and atmospheric deposition are approximately 381 and 980 kg/year, respectively. Results indicate that during the mass balance field collection years of 1994-1995, the Fox, Grand, Calumet, and Kalamazoo Rivers had the largest tributary loads of PCBs to Lake Michigan. When all gross input and output fluxes are summed, the system exhibits a net loss of approximately 3,229 kg/year of PCBs. The mass balance results demonstrate the importance of contaminant cycling and the dynamic interactions among air, water, and sediments. These interactions, with present PCB inventories already in the lake, will continue to control PCB concentrations in the system.

LM Food Chain, linked to LM2-Toxic, and MICHTOX were used to forecast future concentrations of PCBs in lake trout at two sites for various loading scenarios. Scenarios included constant 1994-1995 conditions, fast continued recovery with an atmospheric load half-life of 6.0 years, slow continued recovery with an atmospheric load half-life of 20.0 years, and various combinations of reduced atmospheric and tributary loadings. Forecasts indicate that PCBs concentrations in lake trout will continue to decrease. For the fast continued recovery scenario, the target level for the unrestricted consumption of fish (0.075 ppm) was forecasted to be achieved for five to six year-old lake trout between the years 2030 and 2036. The narrow forecast range for scenarios, past actions, the long-term decrease in loads, and decreasing PCB concentrations in the system indicate that PCBs are presently controlled by dynamic interactions among media, as well as air and sediment cycling. Model results from the present two models are compared. In the future, these results will be compared to those from a greater-resolution model under development (LM3-

Toxic). It is anticipated that the higher-resolution model will better delineate the nearshore and sediment zones, define lake interactions with tributary inputs, and describe PCBs in lake trout populations.

This synthetic lake-wide perspective is anticipated to aid managers in moving forward on pollution prevention, remedial actions, and legislative priorities associated with the Lake Michigan Lake-wide Management Plans. It will also help describe expected local improvements associated with Remedial Action Plans in Areas of Concern. *This abstract does not necessarily reflect USEPA policy.*

Table of Contents

Notice	ii
Foreword	iii
Abstract	v
Table of Contents	vii
List of Figures	xviii
List of Tables	xxx
Abbreviations	xxxvi
Acknowledgments	xxxviii
Executive Summary	xxxix
 Part 1 Introduction	 1
Chapter 1 Project Overview	1
1.1.1 Background	1
1.1.2 Description	2
1.1.3 Scope	3
1.1.3.1 Modeled Pollutants	3
1.1.3.1.1 PCBs	3
1.1.3.1.2 Isomer <i>trans</i> -Nonachlor	5
1.1.3.1.3 Atrazine	5
1.1.3.1.4 Mercury	5
1.1.3.2 Other Measured Parameters	6
1.1.3.3 Measured Compartments	6
1.1.4 Objectives	6
1.1.5 Design	7
1.1.5.1 Organization	7
1.1.5.2 Study Participants	9
1.1.5.3 Workgroups	9
1.1.5.4 Information Management	9
1.1.5.4.1 Data Reporting	10
1.1.5.4.2 Great Lakes Environmental Monitoring Database	11
1.1.5.4.3 Public Access to LMMBP Data	11
1.1.5.5 Quality Assurance Program	11
1.1.6 Project Documents and Products	13

Chapter 2	PCBs Modeling Overview	16
1.2.1	Background	16
1.2.2	Modeling Objectives	16
1.2.3	Historical Modeling	17
1.2.3.1	Lake-1	17
1.2.3.2	Completely-Mixed Model	18
1.2.3.3	General Mass Balance Framework for Toxic Chemicals in the Great Lakes	18
1.2.3.4	Food Web Bioaccumulation Model	18
1.2.3.5	MICHTOX	18
1.2.3.6	Green Bay Mass Balance Project	19
1.2.3.7	SEDZL	19
1.2.4	Model Resolution	19
1.2.5	Models Developed and Applied	21
1.2.5.1	Lake Process Models	21
1.2.5.2	Hydrodynamics (POM)	21
1.2.5.3	Eutrophication/Sorbent Dynamics (LM3-Eutro)	22
1.2.5.4	Contaminant Transport and Fate (LM2-Toxic)	22
1.2.5.5	Food Web Bioaccumulation (LM Food Chain)	23
1.2.6	Model Quality Assurance	23
1.2.7	Model Application and Computational Aspects	23
1.2.7.1	Annual Simulations	23
1.2.7.2	Long-Term Simulations	23
Chapter 3	Information Management	26
1.3.1	Overview of Information Management at the LLRS	26
1.3.2	Calculation of Total PCBs	28
1.3.3	Regression Analysis of Measured Congener, Total PCB Data	28
1.3.4	Summary	30
Appendix 1.3.1	List of Parameters Analyzed and Principal Investigators for the LMMBP	31
Appendix 1.3.2	Example of Data Verification Checklist Used for the LMMBP	35
Appendix 1.3.3	Printout of Information Stored in the LMMBP Tracking Database (R:/Access2000/Immb/Imtrack.mdb)	39
Appendix 1.3.4	Generalized Format for the LMMBP Water Data to be Analyzed With IDL Programs	44
Appendix 1.3.5	Generalized Format for the LMMBP Sediment Data to be Analyzed With IDL Programs	46
Appendix 1.3.6	Generalized Format for the LMMBP Fish Data to be Analyzed With IDL Programs	48
Appendix 1.3.7	Documents From Marcia Kuehl Discussing How Total PCBs Were Calculated by Focus Groups	50
Appendix 1.3.8	Uncertainty of Z Values (Slope of Linear Regression Line) for PCBs in Media Modeled at the LLRS for the LMMBP	53

Chapter 4 Representativeness of the LMMBP Years Relative to Lake Michigan's Historic Record	55
1.4.1 Introduction	55
1.4.2 Ice Cover	55
1.4.3 Water and Air Temperatures	56
1.4.4 Lake Water Levels	59
1.4.5 Precipitation	59
1.4.5.1 Annual Comparisons	59
1.4.5.2 Monthly Comparisons	59
1.4.6 Tributary Flows	59
1.4.7 Wave Heights	59
1.4.8 Summary	63
Chapter 5 PCBs in the Lake Michigan Ecosystem	66
1.5.1 Introduction	66
1.5.2 Atmospheric	66
1.5.2.1 Vapor Phase	66
1.5.2.2 Precipitation	69
1.5.2.3 Particulate	71
1.5.2.4 Dry Deposition	71
1.5.3 Lake Water	71
1.5.3.1 Total PCBs	71
1.5.3.2 Dissolved PCBs	71
1.5.3.3 Particulate PCBs	78
1.5.4 Tributaries	78
1.5.5 Sediment	83
1.5.6 Biota	86
1.5.7 Summary	86
Chapter 6 Congener Pattern Matching of Data Collected for the Lake Michigan Mass Balance Project (LMMBP)	93
1.6.1 Introduction	93
1.6.2 Analytical Approach	94
1.6.3 Methodology	94
1.6.4 Results	94
1.6.4.1 Comparison of Modeled Congener Patterns to All Analyzed Congener Patterns	94
1.6.4.2 Comparison of Median to Mean Data	97
1.6.4.3 Comparison of Congener Patterns in Different Media in Segment 2/ Saugatuck Biota Box	97
1.6.4.4 Comparison of Atmospheric Congener Data	101
1.6.4.5 Comparison of Tributary Congener Patterns	103
1.6.4.6 Comparison of Ages 5 and 6 Lake Trout Congener Patterns in All Biota Boxes	105
1.6.4.7 Comparison of Different Lake Trout Age Class Congener Patterns in Saugatuck Biota Box	105
1.6.5 Conclusions	105

Chapter 7 Hindcasting and Forecasting Functions for PCBs in the Lake Michigan Ecosystem	110
1.7.1 Introduction	110
1.7.2 Forecast Functions	110
1.7.2.1 Tributary Loads	111
1.7.2.2 Atmospheric Loads	112
1.7.3 Hindcast Functions	112
1.7.4 Estimated PCB Storage	117
Part 2 LM2-Eutro	120
Chapter 1 Conclusions (Executive Summary)	120
Chapter 2 Recommendations	123
Chapter 3 Model Description	125
2.3.1 Transport Scheme for Lake Michigan	125
2.3.2 Sediments	126
2.3.3 Formulation of Eutrophication Equations	126
Appendix 2.3.1 Development of LM3-Eutro Equations	130
A2.3.1.1 Phytoplankton Growth	130
A2.3.1.2 Zooplankton Kinetics	133
A2.3.1.3 Carbon Interactions	133
A2.3.1.4 Phosphorus	135
A2.3.1.5 Nitrogen	137
A2.3.1.6 Silica	138
Chapter 4 Model Input and Field Data	140
2.4.1 Loading and Sediment-Water Interactions	140
2.4.1.1 Atmospheric Loads	140
2.4.1.2 Tributary Loads	140
2.4.1.3 Shoreline Erosion	141
2.4.1.4 Sediment	142
2.4.2 Field Data	142
2.4.2.1 Open Lake Nutrient and Carbon Data	142
2.4.2.1.1 Total Phosphorus	142
2.4.2.1.2 Dissolved Phosphorus	144
2.4.2.1.3 Soluble Reactive Phosphorus	144
2.4.2.1.4 Nitrate	145
2.4.2.1.5 Ammonia	145
2.4.2.1.6 Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen	145
2.4.2.1.7 Dissolved Silica	145
2.4.2.1.8 Dissolved Organic Carbon	145

2.4.2.1.9	Particulate Organic Carbon	145
2.4.2.1.10	Green Bay Nutrient Data	145
2.4.2.2	Plankton	146
2.4.2.2.1	Phytoplankton	146
2.4.2.2.2	Chlorophyll <i>a</i>	146
2.4.2.2.3	Phytoplankton Carbon	147
2.4.2.2.4	Zooplankton	149
2.4.2.2.5	Zooplankton Carbon	150
2.4.3	Initial Conditions	150
2.4.4	Parameter Estimation	152
2.4.4.1	Physical Measurements	152
2.4.4.1.1	Secchi Disk	152
2.4.4.1.2	Solar Radiation and Temperature	152
2.4.4.2	Primary Production Estimates	152
Appendix 2.4.1	Modeled Versus Measured Variables	157
Chapter 5	Calibration	159
2.5.1	Description of Process	159
2.5.2	Selection of Best Calibration	160
2.5.2.1	Phytoplankton	160
2.5.2.2	Particulate Organic Carbon	167
2.5.2.3	Total Phosphorus	167
2.5.2.4	Dissolved Silica	167
Chapter 6	Model Confirmation	168
2.6.1	Additional Field Data	168
2.6.2	MICH1 Model	168
2.6.3	Comparison of LM3-Eutro to the MICH1 Model and Field Data	168
Chapter 7	Results – Application of Model	171
2.7.1	Scenario 1 – Constant Conditions	171
2.7.1.1	Description of Assumptions	171
2.7.1.2	Results and Discussion	171
2.7.2	Scenario 2 – Virtual Elimination (Lower Bound)	171
2.7.2.1	Description of Assumptions	171
2.7.2.2	Results and Discussion	171
2.7.3	Scenario 3 – Best Estimate of Current Trends Resulting From Previous Actions	173
2.7.3.1	Description of Assumptions	173
2.7.3.2	Results and Discussion	173
2.7.4	Scenario 4 – Scenario 1 With Instantaneous Reduction of Tributary Loads to Zero	173
2.7.4.1	Description of Assumptions	173
2.7.4.2	Results and Discussion	174

2.7.5	Scenario 5 – Scenario 1 With Instantaneous Reduction of Atmospheric Loads to Zero	174
2.7.5.1	Description of Assumptions	174
2.7.5.2	Results and Discussion	174
2.7.6	Scenario 6 – Scenario 1 With Tributary and Atmospheric Loads Increased 20%	174
2.7.6.1	Description of Assumptions	174
2.7.6.2	Results and Discussion	176
2.7.7	Scenario 7 – Application of Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement Loads to Model	176
2.7.7.1	Description of Assumptions	176
2.7.7.2	Results and Discussion	177
2.7.8	Scenario 8 – Estimate of Total Maximum Daily Loads to Reach International Joint Commission’s Target Total Phosphorus Concentration	177
2.7.8.1	Description of Assumptions	177
2.7.8.2	Results and Discussion	177
2.7.9	Scenario Comparison and Discussion	177
2.7.10	Mass Budget	177
	Chapter 8 Results Provided for LM2-Toxic	182
2.8.1	Description	182
2.8.2	Manipulation of Results	182
Part 3	Level 1 Models	183
	Chapter 1 MICHTOX PCB Model Executive Summary	183
	Chapter 2 MICHTOX Recommendations	185
	Chapter 3 MICHTOX PCB Fate and Transport Modeling	186
3.3.1	Description	186
3.3.2	Description of Data Used in MICHTOX	189
3.3.2.1	Water Column PCB Concentrations	189
3.3.2.2	Surficial Sediment PCB Concentrations	189
3.3.2.3	Atmospheric and Tributary Loads	189
3.3.3	Model Confirmation	191
3.3.3.1	Description of Hindcast Process	191
3.3.3.2	Hindcast Results	192
3.3.3.3	Comparison to the LMMBP Data	196
3.3.4	Model Uncertainty	198
	Chapter 4 MICHTOX Food Chain Modeling	201
3.4.1	Model Development	201
3.4.2	Description of the Data Used in MICHTOX Food Chain	202
3.4.2.1	Description of Data	202
3.4.2.2	Sources and Choice of Constants	203

3.4.3	Model Confirmation	203
3.4.4	Results – Forecast Scenarios	207
3.4.4.1	Conditions Remain the Same as 1994-1995 (Constant Conditions)	207
3.4.4.2	Continued Recovery – Fast	208
3.4.4.3	Continued Recovery – Slow	209
3.4.5	Model Sensitivity	209
3.4.5.1	No Atmospheric Wet and Dry Deposition Loadings	209
3.4.5.2	No Tributary Loadings	210
3.4.5.3	No Atmospheric Deposition and No Tributary Loadings	210
3.4.5.4	Sediment Total PCB Concentration Initial Conditions Set to Zero	210
Appendix 3.4.1	Derivation of a Hypothetical Lake Michigan Lake Trout Fish Consumption Criteria for PCBs	212
Part 4	LM2-Toxic	216
Chapter 1	Executive Summary	216
Chapter 2	Recommendations	221
Chapter 3	Model Description	223
4.3.1	Model Framework	223
4.3.2	Model Configuration	224
4.3.2.1	Spatial Resolution – Segmentation	224
4.3.2.2	Temporal Resolution	228
4.3.3	Water Balance	228
4.3.4	Solid Balance	231
4.3.4.1	Solid Kinetics	232
4.3.4.2	Sediment Transport	233
4.3.4.2.1	Steady-State Resuspension Calibration	234
4.3.4.2.2	Empirical Wave-Induced Resuspension Calculation	235
4.3.4.2.3	The Sediment Bed – Semi-Lagrangian Option	237
4.3.5	Chemical Balance	238
4.3.5.1	PCB Partitioning	239
4.3.5.2	PCB Air-Water Exchange	240
4.3.5.3	PCB-Specific Parameterization	242
4.3.6	Modification	242
Appendix 4.3.1	Lake Michigan Resuspension Field Data Set	246
Appendix 4.3.2	Notes From Nathan Hawley on the Data Set in Appendix 4.3.1	247
Chapter 4	Model and Field Data	248
4.4.1	Water Transport	248
4.4.1.1	Circulation	248
4.4.1.2	Vertical Dispersion	250
4.4.1.3	Verification of Water Transport Fields	250

4.4.2	Organic Carbon	257
4.4.2.1	Loads	257
4.4.2.2	Field Data and Initial Conditions	258
4.4.2.3	Parameterization	266
4.4.3	PCBs	271
4.4.3.1	Loading	272
4.4.3.2	Field Data, Initial Conditions, and Boundary Conditions	273
4.4.3.3	Parameterization	273
4.4.3.4	Kinetic Time Functions	281
Appendix 4.4.1	Sample Data Interpolation for the LMMBP	286
A.4.4.1.1	The Distance Square Inverse Method	287
A.4.4.1.2	The Natural-Neighborhood Method	287
A.4.4.1.3	Application	288
A4.4.1.3.1	Contouring Plots	288
A.4.4.1.3.2	Volume-Weighted Averaging With Formulations	288
A.4.4.1.4	Discussion	289
A.4.4.1.5	Steps to Run nngridr	289
Chapter 5	LM-2 Toxic Calibration and Confirmation	291
4.5.1	Vertical Dispersion Coefficients Calibration	291
4.5.2	Organic Carbon Dynamics Calibration	293
4.5.2.1	Calibration Process/Procedure	293
4.5.2.2	Results and Discussion	293
4.5.3	PCB Dynamics Calibration	294
4.5.3.1	Calibration Procedures	304
4.5.3.2	Results and Discussion	305
4.5.4	The LM2-Toxic Confirmation	313
4.5.4.1	Mass Balance Checking	313
4.5.4.2	Chloride Model	313
4.5.4.3	¹³⁷ Cs and ^{239,240} Pu Simulation and Results	313
4.5.4.4	Long-Term Organic Carbon Simulations	317
4.5.4.5	PCB Hindcast	319
4.5.4.5.1	Data and Procedure for the PCB Hindcast	319
4.5.4.5.2	Results From the LM2-Toxic PCB Hindcast	328
Appendix 4.5.1	Results From Thermal Balance Model	337
Appendix 4.5.2	Calibrated Results for Organic Carbons	349
Appendix 4.5.3	Calibration Results for PCB ₂₈₊₃₁ and ΣPCBs	365
Appendix 4.5.4	Simulation Results From Chloride	418
Appendix 4.5.5	Primary Production for the LM2-Toxic	426
Chapter 6	The LM2-Toxic Application and Interpretation	430
4.6.1	Conversion of PCB Congener Results to Total PCBs	430
4.6.2	Mass Budget Diagnosis of the LM2-Toxic for the LMMBP Period	430

4.6.3	LM2-Toxic Application for Long-Term Forecast and Sensitivity Scenarios	436
4.6.4	Results of the Forecast and Sensitivity Scenarios and Discussion	437
4.6.5	Results Provided for the LM Food Chain Model	442
Chapter 7 LM2-Toxic Sensitivity Analysis		444
4.7.1	Primary Production Sensitivity	444
4.7.2	PCB Loads Sensitivity	450
Part 5	LM Food Chain	453
Chapter 1 Executive Summary		453
Chapter 2 Recommendations		455
5.2.1	Additional Model Validations	455
5.2.2	Model Applications	455
5.2.3	Future Improvements	456
Chapter 3 Model Description		457
5.3.1	Chemical Bioaccumulation in Fish	457
5.3.1.1	Chemical Uptake From Water	458
5.3.1.2	Chemical Uptake From Prey	459
5.3.1.3	Chemical Elimination <i>Via</i> Gills	459
5.3.1.4	Chemical Dilution by Growth	460
5.3.2	Chemical Bioaccumulation in the Base of Food Webs	460
5.3.2.1	Chemical Bioaccumulation in Zooplankton	460
5.3.2.2	Chemical Bioaccumulation in <i>Diporeia</i>	461
5.3.3	Model Description of Exposure Environment	462
Chapter 4 Description of Data, Constants, and Other Information Necessary to Run Model		465
5.4.1	Chemical Properties of PCB Contaminants	465
5.4.2	Site-Specific Data	465
5.4.2.1	Fish Food Web Structures	465
5.4.2.1.1	Lake Trout Food Web	465
5.4.2.1.2	Coho Salmon Food Web	468
5.4.2.2	Fish Growth Rates	475
5.4.2.3	Energy Density of Food Web Components	476
5.4.2.4	Exposure Conditions	476
5.4.2.4.1	PCB Concentrations in Water	481
5.4.2.4.2	PCB Concentrations in Sediment	481
5.4.2.4.3	Exposure Temperature	483
5.4.2.4.4	Oxygen Concentration in Water	483

5.4.3	Physiological Data of Fish and Other Organisms	483
5.4.3.1	Species-Specific Respiration Rates	483
5.4.3.2	Respiration Rates Adjusted for Specific Dynamic Action (SDA)	486
5.4.4	Calibrated Model Parameters	487
	Chapter 5 Calibration	492
5.5.1	Introduction	492
5.5.2	Description of Process	492
5.5.3	Calibration Results	493
5.5.4	Field Data for PCBs in Fish and Their Comparisons to Calibrated Model Outputs	495
	Appendix 5.5.1 PCB Concentrations	502
	Appendix 5.5.2 Agreement Between Modeled and Observed PCB Concentrations	516
	Chapter 6 Model Verification	526
5.6.1	Introduction	526
5.6.2	Model Applicability to Other Sites	526
	Chapter 7 Model Sensitivity and Uncertainty	528
5.7.1	Introduction	528
5.7.2	Sensitivity Analysis	528
5.7.2.1	Chemical Assimilation Efficiency (α)	529
5.7.2.2	Food Assimilation Efficiency (β)	529
5.7.2.3	Chemical Relative Gill Transfer Coefficient (E_c/E_o)	531
5.7.2.4	The Fraction of Ingested Energy for Specific Dynamic Action (SDA)	531
5.7.2.5	Fish Growth Rate	532
5.7.2.6	Octanol-Water Partition Coefficient K_{ow}	533
5.7.2.7	Fish Diet	533
	Chapter 8 Model Application	536
5.8.1	Introduction	536
5.8.2	Simulation of Fish PCB Levels Based on Hypothetical Exposure Inputs	536
5.8.2.1	Exposure Concentration Inputs Used for Model Simulations	536
5.8.2.2	Responses of Fish Models to Different Exposure Inputs	537
5.8.2.3	Discussion	542
Part 6	Comparison of Model Results	544
6.1	Summary	544
6.2	Comparison of Models	545
6.2.1	Model Similarities	545
6.2.2	Model Differences	546
6.3	Comparison of Model Results	547
6.3.1	Comparison of Mass Budget Analyses	547
6.3.2	Comparison of Model Forecast Scenarios	547

Part 7	Appendices	552
	Appendix 7.1 Lake Michigan Mass Balance Project (LMMBP) PCB Peer Review Report	552
7.1.1	Executive Summary	552
7.1.2	LMMBP Peer Review Panel	553
7.1.3	LMMBP PCB Charge to Peer Reviewers	553
	7.1.3.1 Overall Multimedia Ecosystem Modeling Approach	555
	7.1.3.2 Overall Model Performance	555
	7.1.3.3 Suitability for Management	555
7.1.4	Modelers' Responses to Peer Review Comments	555
7.1.5	Modelers' Responses to Specific Comments Made by Peer Review Panel Member – James Martin	563
	Appendix 7.2 Comments as Received From Dr. James Martin Peer Review Summary: Lake Michigan Mass Balance Project	573
7.2.1	General Comments	573
	7.2.1.1 Overall Multi-Media Ecosystem Modeling Approach	573
	7.2.1.2 Overall Model Performance	573
	7.2.1.3 Suitability for Management	574
7.2.2	Specific Recommendations	574
	7.2.2.1 POM and Linkages	574
	7.2.2.2 LM2-Eutro and LM3-Eutro	574
	7.2.2.3 Level 1 Model	575
	7.2.2.4 LM2-Toxic	575
	7.2.2.5 LM Food Chain	575
	7.2.2.6 LM3-Toxic	575
7.2.3	Specific Comments	575
	7.2.3.1 Hydrodynamics and POM Linkage	575
	7.2.3.2 LM2-Eutro and LM3-Eutro	577
	7.2.3.3 Level 1 Model	577
	7.2.3.4 LM2-Toxic	578
	7.2.3.5 LM Food Chain	579

List of Figures

1.1.1	Simplified mass balance approach	2
1.1.2	The LMMBP sampling locations	8
1.1.3	Flow of information in the LMMBP	10
1.2.1	Surface water segmentation for alternative Lake Michigan mass balance model levels	20
1.2.2	Model construct used for the LMMBP to model PCBs	22
1.4.1	Location of the NOAA's buoys in Lake Michigan	56
1.4.2	Monthly mean water temperatures in southern Lake Michigan	58
1.4.3	Monthly mean water temperatures in northern Lake Michigan	58
1.4.4	Mean June water temperatures in southern Lake Michigan	58
1.4.5	Mean June water temperatures in northern Lake Michigan	58
1.4.6	Monthly mean air temperatures in southern Lake Michigan	60
1.4.7	Monthly mean air temperatures in northern Lake Michigan	60
1.4.8	Mean June air temperatures in southern Lake Michigan	60
1.4.9	Mean June air temperatures in northern Lake Michigan	60
1.4.10	Record of mean monthly water levels for Lake Michigan	60
1.4.11	Annual precipitation to Lake Michigan between 1949 and 1998	60
1.4.12	Comparison of 1982, 1983, 1994, and 1995 monthly mean precipitation to the means for the period of 1949 through 1998	61
1.4.13	Comparison of tributary flow for hydrodynamic model calibration (1982-1983) to the historic means	61

1.4.14	Comparison of tributary flow for the study period (1994-1995) to the historic means	62
1.5.1	Median concentration of vapor phase PCBs in the atmosphere during 1994 and 1995 for all seasons of both years	68
1.5.2	Time variation of vapor phase PCBs in Lake Michigan	70
1.5.3	Time variation of vapor phase PCBs in Lake Michigan at Sleeping Bear Dunes based on IADN data	70
1.5.4	Median concentration of wet (precipitation) PCBs in the atmosphere during 1994 and 1995 for all seasons of both years	72
1.5.5	Time variation of precipitation PCBs in Lake Michigan at Sleeping Bear Dunes based on IADN data	73
1.5.6	Median concentration of particulate PCBs in the atmosphere during 1994 and 1995 for all seasons of both years	74
1.5.7	Time variation of atmospheric particulate PCBs in Lake Michigan at Sleeping Bear Dunes based on IADN data	75
1.5.8	Distribution of total PCBs (ng/L) in 1994-1995 Lake Michigan water	76
1.5.9	Time variation of total PCBs in Lake Michigan water	77
1.5.10	Time variation of total PCBs in Lake Michigan water since 1986	78
1.5.11	Distribution of dissolved PCBs (ng/L) in 1994-1995 Lake Michigan water	79
1.5.12	Distribution of dissolved PCBs (ng/L) in 1994-1995 summer hypolimnetic Lake Michigan water	80
1.5.13	Time variation of dissolved PCBs in Lake Michigan water	81
1.5.14	Distribution of particulate PCBs (ng/L) in 1994-1995 Lake Michigan water	81
1.5.15	Time variation of particulate PCBs in Lake Michigan water	82
1.5.16	Relative loads of PCBs to Lake Michigan from tributaries	83
1.5.17	Total PCBs in 1994-1995 Lake Michigan surficial sediments (ng/g)	85
1.5.18	Vertical variation of PCBs in dated sediment cores collected for the LMMBP	85
1.5.19	Vertical variation of PCBs in dated sediment cores reported by Swackhamer and Armstrong (1988)	87
1.5.20	Vertical variation of PCBs in dated sediment cores reported by Hermanson <i>et al.</i> (1991)	87

1.5.21	Vertical variation of PCBs in dated sediment cores reported by Golden <i>et al.</i> (1993)	88
1.5.22	Vertical variation of PCBs in dated sediment cores reported by Schneider <i>et al.</i> (2001)	88
1.5.23	PCB concentrations in various members of the lake trout food web during the LMMBP	89
1.5.24	PCB concentrations in various age classes of lake trout during the LMMBP	90
1.5.25	Time variation of PCB concentration in five to six year-old lake trout from Lake Michigan	90
1.5.26	Time variation of PCB concentrations in bloater from Lake Michigan	91
1.6.1	LM2 surface water segmentation and LMMBP biota boxes	94
1.6.2	Cumulative frequency distribution – PCB congeners in segment 2 vapor phase	98
1.6.3	Cumulative frequency distribution – PCB congeners in segment 2 dry deposition.	98
1.6.4	Cumulative frequency distribution – PCB congeners in segment 2 wet deposition	98
1.6.5	Cumulative frequency distribution – dissolved PCB congeners in segment 2 water	98
1.6.6	Cumulative frequency distribution – particulate PCB congeners in segment 2 water.	98
1.6.7	Cumulative frequency distribution – PCB congeners in segment 2 surficial sediment	98
1.6.8	Cumulative frequency distribution – dissolved PCB congeners in Kalamazoo River water	99
1.6.9	Cumulative frequency distribution – particulate PCB congeners in Kalamazoo River water . . .	99
1.6.10	Cumulative frequency distribution – age 5-6 Saugatuck lake trout	99
1.6.11	Cumulative frequency distribution – PCB congeners in segment 2 vapor phase	99
1.6.12	Cumulative frequency distribution – PCB congeners in segment 2 dry deposition.	99
1.6.13	Cumulative frequency distribution – dissolved PCB congeners in Kalamazoo River water	99
1.6.14	Cumulative frequency distribution – particulate PCB congeners in Kalamazoo River water . . .	100
1.6.15	Cumulative frequency distribution – PCB congeners in segment 2 wet deposition	100
1.6.16	Cumulative frequency distribution – dissolved PCB congeners in Saugatuck water	100
1.6.17	Cumulative frequency distribution – particulate PCB congeners in Saugatuck water	100
1.6.18	Cumulative frequency distribution – PCB congeners in surficial sediment.	100

1.6.19	Cumulative frequency distribution – PCB congeners in age 5-6 Saugatuck lake trout	100
1.6.20	PCB congeners in segment 2, Saugatuck	101
1.6.21	Air sampling locations	102
1.6.22	Lake Michigan high-resolution 5 km x 5 km grid with 19 sigma layers	102
1.6.23	Cumulative frequency distribution (mean) – PCB congeners in atmospheric vapor phase	103
1.6.24	Cumulative frequency distribution (mean) – PCB congeners in atmospheric wet deposition	103
1.6.25	Cumulative frequency distribution (mean) – PCB congeners in atmospheric dry deposition	103
1.6.26	Cumulative frequency distribution (mean) – PCB congeners in segment 2 atmospheric data	103
1.6.27	PCB congeners in Lake Michigan tributaries	104
1.6.28	Comparison of dissolved PCB congeners in Lake Michigan western tributaries to segment 2 vapor phase	105
1.6.29	Comparison of dissolved PCB congeners in Lake Michigan eastern tributaries to segment 2 water	106
1.6.30	Comparison of particulate PCB congeners in Lake Michigan segment 2 to tributaries	106
1.6.31	Cumulative frequency distribution (mean) – PCB congeners in ages 5 and 6 lake trout	107
1.6.32	Cumulative frequency distribution (mean) – PCB congeners in Saugatuck lake trout	107
1.6.33	Comparison of dissolved PCB congeners in west side-to-east side of Lake Michigan tributaries	108
1.6.34	Comparison of particulate PCB congeners in west side-to-east side of Lake Michigan tributaries	108
1.7.1	Locations of dated cores analyzed for PCBs by Hermanson <i>et al.</i> (1981), Swackhamer and Armstrong (1988), Schneider <i>et al.</i> (2001), Golden <i>et al.</i> (1993), and P. Van Hoof (personal communication) for the LMMBP	113
1.7.2	Fit of concentration functions to observed data for core 15	114
1.7.3	Lake Michigan non-depositional (0-40 m), transitional (40-100 m), and depositional (> 100 m) zones based on water depth and the depth of wind-wave interaction with sediments	116

1.7.4	Comparison of load function to ^{210}Pb focusing factor corrected core 15 loads	117
2.4.1	The LMMBP sampling locations	143
2.4.2	Lake-wide phytoplankton carbon calculated from biovolume data and carbon-to-chlorophyll <i>a</i> ratios for the eight LMMBP cruises	148
2.4.3	Level 2 model segmentation for LM3-Eutro.	151
2.4.4	Lake-wide Secchi depths for the eight LMMBP cruises	153
2.5.1	Level 2 and Level 3 model segmentation	159
2.5.2	LM3-Eutro model versus laboratory primary production	161
2.5.3	Level 3 LM3-Eutro model predictions versus field data, lake-wide.	164
2.5.4	Level 2 LM3-Eutro model output versus field data for selected segments.	165
2.5.5	Level 3 LM3-Eutro model output versus field data for selected nearshore and offshore cells	166
2.6.1	MICH1 versus LM3-Eutro model predictions and available field data	170
2.7.1	Scenario 1: Constant Conditions	172
2.7.2	Scenario 2: Virtual elimination	172
2.7.3	Historical total phosphorus loading – Lake Michigan	173
2.7.4	Scenario 3: Best estimate of current trends resulting from previous actions	174
2.7.5	Scenario 4: Scenario 1 with tributary load elimination	175
2.7.6	Scenario 5: Scenario 1 with atmospheric load elimination	175
2.7.7	Scenario 6: Scenario 1 with tributary and atmospheric loads increased 20%	176
2.7.8	Scenario 7: Application of the GLWQA loads to model.	178
2.7.9	Scenario 8: Estimate of the TMDL to reach the IJC's target total phosphorus concentration	178
2.7.10	Annual average (1994-1995) Lake Michigan total phosphorus loading (kg/year)	180
2.7.11	Annual average (1994-1995) Lake Michigan and Green Bay total phosphorus loading (kg/year)	181
3.3.1	MICHTOX PCB mass balance schematic	187

3.3.2	MICHTOX model segmentation	188
3.3.3	Long-term estimates of Lake Michigan total PCB vapor concentrations	192
3.3.4	Long-term estimates of Lake Michigan total PCB atmospheric deposition loadings	192
3.3.5	Long-term estimates of Lake Michigan total PCB tributary loadings	192
3.3.6	Long-term Scenario A predictions of main lake total PCB concentrations	192
3.3.7	Comparison of long-term Scenario A predictions to main lake sediment total PCB concentrations (sediment cores collected in 1991-1992).	193
3.3.8	Comparison of long-term Scenario A predictions to GLNPO lake trout data.	193
3.3.9	Comparison of MICHTOX Scenario A total PCB concentrations to Sheboygan Reef data	193
3.3.10	Long-term Scenario B predictions of main lake total PCB concentrations.	193
3.3.11	Comparison of long-term Scenario B predictions to the LMMBP deep water dissolved total PCB concentrations	194
3.3.12	Comparison of Scenario B predictions to main lake sediment total PCB concentrations (sediment cores collected in 1991-1992).	194
3.3.13	Comparison of long-term Scenario B predictions to average total PCB sediment concentrations (LMMBP and GBMBP box core samples).	194
3.3.14	Comparison of long-term Scenario B predictions to GLNPO lake trout data.	194
3.3.15	Comparison of long-term Scenario B total PCB concentrations to Sheboygan Reef fish data	195
3.3.16	Long-term Scenario C predictions of main lake total PCB concentrations	195
3.3.17	Comparison of Scenario C predictions to main lake sediment total PCB concentrations (sediment cores collected in 1991-1992).	196
3.3.18	Comparison of long-term Scenario C predictions to GLNPO lake trout data.	196
3.3.19	Comparison of MICHTOX Scenario C total PCB concentrations to Sheboygan Reef fish data	196
3.3.20	Comparison of MICHTOX epilimnetic total PCB concentrations to the LMMBP cruise data	197
3.3.21	Comparison of MICHTOX hypolimnetic total PCB concentrations to the LMMBP cruise data	198

3.3.22	MICHTOX predicted mass balance fluxes and inventories (kg/year) for 1994-1995, whole lake results	199
3.3.23	MICHTOX predicted mass balance fluxes and inventories (kg/year) for 1994-1995, Green Bay and main lake results	199
3.4.1	The LMMBP biota sampling zones	202
3.4.2	Total PCB concentrations of organisms in Lake Michigan biota zones	206
3.4.3	Total PCB concentrations in 5.5 year-old lake trout at Saugatuck biota zone	207
3.4.4a	Sensitivity scenario predicted total PCB concentrations in 5.5 year-old lake trout from Saugatuck biota zone	208
3.4.4b	Sensitivity scenario total PCB predictions and the fish consumption target level	208
3.4.5a	Model application scenario total PCB predictions in 5.5 year-old lake trout from the Saugatuck biota zone	208
3.4.5b	Application scenario total PCB predictions and the fish consumption target level	208
3.4.6	Sensitivity scenario total PCB concentration predictions for 5.5 year-old lake trout at Saugatuck	209
A3.4.1	Whole fish to edible portion of fish PCBs and lipid ratios for lake trout	214
A3.4.2	Comparison of whole fish to fillet PCB ratios and lipid content for various fish species	214
4.1.1	Mass budget average for 1994-1995 total PCBs Lake Michigan system (including Green Bay)	218
4.1.2	Annual long-term responses of total PCB concentrations in the water column of Lake Michigan for the forecast and sensitivity scenarios	219
4.3.1	Water column segmentation for the LM2-Toxic model	225
4.3.2	Surface sediment segmentation for the LM2-Toxic model	226
4.3.3	Cross-sectional sediment segmentation and overlying water column segments for 10 Lake Michigan and four Green Bay water columns	227
4.3.4	Conceptual framework of organic carbon sorbent dynamics used in the LM2-Toxic model	232
4.3.5	Schematic of conceptualization for the steady-state mass balance analysis for PDC vertical transport	234
4.3.6	Locations of the 30 deployments between 1994 and 2000	236

4.3.7	Regression analysis on the data set (resuspension observed only)	237
4.3.8	Conceptual framework used by the LM2-Toxic model for PCB congeners in Lake Michigan	238
4.4.1	Locations of 10 tributaries whose flows were considered a part of the water transport used in the LM2-Toxic	249
4.4.2	Locations of monitored and unmonitored tributaries during the LMMBP	253
4.4.3	Lake Michigan water sampling sites during the LMMBP	254
4.4.4	Primary production generated from the LM3-Eutro for Lake Michigan, including Green Bay	257
4.4.5	Lake Michigan sediment sampling sites of organic carbon during the LMMBP	265
4.4.6	Distribution of POC in Lake Michigan surficial sediments (mg/g _{dw})	265
4.4.7	Distribution of POC in Lake Michigan surficial sediments (mg/L)	266
4.4.8	Σ PCBs tributary (11 monitored and 18 unmonitored tributaries) loads to Lake Michigan during the LMMBP period	272
4.4.9	Estimated Σ PCBs atmospheric loads including dry and wet deposition into Lake Michigan during the LMMBP period	273
4.4.10	Lake Michigan atmospheric sampling sites during the LMMBP	275
4.4.11	Seasonal variation of Σ PCB vapor phase concentrations observed during the LMMBP	276
4.4.12	Lake Michigan sediment sampling sites for PCBs during the LMMBP	277
4.4.13	Distribution of Σ PCBs in Lake Michigan surficial sediments (ng/g _{dw})	278
4.4.14	Distribution of Σ PCBs in Lake Michigan surficial sediments (ng/L)	278
4.4.15	Comparison between the estimated log $K'_{\text{POC},\alpha}$ for the LMMBP selected PCB congeners based on the two-phase partitioning model and K_{ow} calculated by Hawker and Connell (1988) for all 209 PCB congeners	281
4.5.1a	Comparison between the temporal profiles for temperature from the LM2-Toxic	292
4.5.1b	Comparison between the temporal profiles for temperature results from the Princeton Ocean Hydrodynamic model	292
4.5.2	Temporal profiles of DOC in the Lake Michigan water column segments for the organic carbon dynamics calibration of the LM2-Toxic and the LMMBP cruise mean data	295

4.5.3	Temporal profiles of BIC in the Lake Michigan water column segments for the organic carbon dynamics calibration of the LM2-Toxic and the LMMBP cruise mean data	298
4.5.4.	Temporal profiles of PDC in the Lake Michigan water column segments for the organic carbon dynamics calibration of the LM2-Toxic and the LMMBP cruise mean data	301
4.5.5	Observed data versus the LM2-Toxic predictions for DOC, BIC, and PDC for the LMMBP period	304
4.5.6	Temporal profiles of PCB ₂₈₊₃₁ (dissolved phase + particulate phase) in Lake Michigan water column segments for PCB dynamics calibration of the LM2-Toxic and the LMMBP cruise mean data	306
4.5.7	Temporal profiles of ΣPCBs (dissolved phase + particulate phase) in Lake Michigan water segments for PCB dynamics calibration of the LM2-Toxic and the LMMBP cruise mean data	309
4.5.8	Observed data versus the LM2-Toxic predictions for PCB ₂₈₊₃₁ and ΣPCBs for the LMMBP period	312
4.5.9	Lake-wide average concentrations of (a) ¹³⁷ Cs and (b) ^{239,240} Pu computed by the LM2 radionuclide model over 46 years (1950-1995)	318
4.5.10	Sediment ¹³⁷ Cs inventory comparison between the observed data and the LM2 radionuclide model outputs	318
4.5.11	Reconstructed historical total PCB loading time functions and sediment core LM94-15A total PCB concentration profiles for Lake Michigan	323
4.5.12	Reconstructed total PCB vapor phase concentrations and total PCB loading time functions for Lake Michigan	323
4.5.13	Reconstructed total organic carbon load (primary production + LMMBP tributary loads) for Lake Michigan	325
4.5.14	The sampling sites of the sediment box core samples (LM94-15A, LM95-61A, LM95-87A) taken during the LMMBP for which vertical PCB concentration profiles were analyzed and available	327
4.5.15	Annual lake-wide average total PCB water column concentrations from the LM2-Toxic PCB hindcast simulation	329
4.5.16	Monthly lake-wide average total PCB water column concentrations from the LM2-Toxic PCB hindcast simulation	329
4.5.17	Annual average total PCB concentration profiles in the sediment depositional zone from the LM2-Toxic PCB hindcast simulation	330
4.5.18	ΣPCB mass budget of Lake Michigan during the period of the LM2-Toxic PCB hindcast (1949-1995)	332

4.5.5.1	Model data versus measured total phosphorus loads	427
4.5.5.2	Model output versus measured total phosphorus concentration data	428
4.5.5.3	Relationship between lake-wide total phosphorus concentration and primary productivity based on model output from the LM3-Eutro model	428
4.6.1	Mass budget average for 1994-1995 total PCBs in the Lake Michigan system (including Green Bay)	432
4.6.2	1994-1995 total PCB Lake Michigan and Green Bay mass budget (averaged)	433
4.6.3a	Annual long-term responses to total PCB concentrations in the water column of Lake Michigan for the forecast scenarios and USEPA water quality criteria for the protection of wildlife (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2005) and human health (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1997) in the Great Lakes system	438
4.6.3b	Annual long-term responses to total PCB concentrations in the water column of Lake Michigan for the sensitivity scenarios	438
4.6.4a	Monthly long-term responses to total PCB concentrations in the water column of Lake Michigan for the forecast scenarios and USEPA water quality criteria for the protection of wildlife (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2005) and human health (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1997) in the Great Lakes system	439
4.6.4b	Monthly long-term responses to total PCB concentrations in the water column of Lake Michigan for the sensitivity scenarios	439
4.6.5a	Annual long-term responses to total PCB concentrations in the surficial sediment of Lake Michigan for the forecast scenarios	441
4.6.5b	Annual long-term responses to total PCB concentrations in the surficial sediment of Lake Michigan for the sensitivity scenarios	441
4.7.1	Short-term (1994-1995) variations of lake-wide (Green Bay included) organic carbon concentrations for $\pm 50\%$ primary production changes without adjusting settling and resuspension rates	445
4.7.2	Long-term (1994-2055) variations of lake-wide (Green Bay included) organic carbon concentrations for $\pm 50\%$ primary production changes without adjusting settling and resuspension rates	446
4.7.3	Short-term (1994-1995) variations of lake-wide (Green Bay included) PCB ₂₈₊₃₁ (dissolved + particulate) concentrations for $\pm 50\%$ primary production changes without adjusting settling and resuspension rates	448
4.7.4	Long-term (1994-2055) variations of lake-wide (Green Bay included) PCB ₂₈₊₃₁ (dissolved + particulate) concentrations for $\pm 50\%$ primary production changes without adjusting settling and resuspension rates	449

4.7.5	Sensitivity analysis of the LM2-Toxic predictions to varying PCB loads	451
5.3.1	Primary chemical exchange processes between a fish and its environment	458
5.3.2	Comparison of modeling approaches for exposure temperatures in food web models	463
5.4.1	Biota zones in Lake Michigan	467
5.4.2a	Typical annual cycles of exposure temperature for Lake Michigan food webs at Saugatuck and Sturgeon Bay	485
5.4.2b	Typical annual cycles of exposure temperature for Lake Michigan food web at Sheboygan Reef	485
5.4.2c	Typical annual cycles of exposure temperature for coho salmon in Lake Michigan	486
5.5.1	Agreement between modeled and observed fish PCB concentrations in coho salmon using Saugatuck food web (1994 and 1995)	497
5.5.2	Individual comparison between modeled and observed data for PCB congeners in lake trout at Saugatuck (1994 and 1995)	499
5.5.3	Comparison between modeled and observed total PCBs for lake trout at Saugatuck (1994 and 1995)	500
5.7.1	Sensitivity of PCBs in lake trout (age four) to chemical assimilation efficiency presented as ratios of model outputs with modified chemical assimilation efficiency to model outputs with the calibrated chemical assimilation efficiency	530
5.7.2	Effect of changes in food assimilation efficiency on the computed PCB data for lake trout in Lake Michigan presented as ratios of model outputs with modified food assimilation efficiency to model outputs with the calibrated food assimilation efficiency	530
5.7.3	Effect of changes in chemical relative gill transfer coefficient (E_c/E_o) on the computed PCB data for lake trout in Lake Michigan presented as ratios of model outputs with modified chemical relative gill transfer coefficient to model outputs with the calibrated chemical relative gill transfer coefficient	531
5.7.4	Effect of changes in SDA on the computed PCB data for lake trout in Lake Michigan presented as ratios of model outputs with modified SDA parameter to model outputs with the calibrated SDA value	532
5.7.5	Sensitivity of PCBs in lake trout (age four) to fish growth rate presented as the ratios of model outputs with zero lake trout growth rate to model outputs with field estimated growth rate	533
5.7.6	Sensitivity of PCBs in lake trout (age four) to octanol-water partition coefficient ($\log K_{ow}$) presented as ratios of model outputs with $\log K_{ow}$ input reduced by 5% to model outputs with original $\log K_{ow}$ values	534

5.7.7	Sensitivity of PCBs in lake trout (age four) to fish diet presented as ratios of model outputs with modified fish diet to model outputs with field estimated fish diet	534
5.8.1a	PCB congener-specific exposure concentrations at Sturgeon Bay predicted by LM2-Toxic for Scenario A – PCBs in suspended particles of the water column	538
5.8.1b	PCB congener-specific exposure concentrations at Sturgeon Bay predicted by LM2-Toxic for Scenario A – PCBs in the surface sediment	539
5.8.2	Total PCB concentrations of the lake trout in response to the exposure concentration inputs associated with various loading scenarios	540
5.8.3	Total PCB concentrations of the lake trout in response to the exposure concentration inputs associated with various loading scenarios	541
6.1	Supporting models and links for MICHTOX and the LM models	545
6.2	Comparison of the Lake Michigan total PCB mass balance analyses results, 1994-1995	547
6.3	Comparison of model output annual average total PCB water concentrations for the Constant Conditions Scenario	548
6.4	Comparison of model output annual average total PCB sediment concentrations for the Constant Conditions Scenario	549
6.5	Comparison of model output annual average total PCB water concentrations for the Continued Recovery – Fast Scenario	549
6.6	Comparison of the bioaccumulation model annual average total PCB concentration results for the Constant Conditions Scenario	550
6.7	Comparison of the bioaccumulation model annual average total PCB concentration results for the Continued Recovery – Fast Scenario	551

List of Tables

1.1.1	Characteristics of the LMMBP Modeled Pollutants	4
1.1.2	The LMMBP Parameters	7
1.3.1	Revised Regression Equations for the LMMBP Total PCBs in All Media	29
1.3.2	Ratio of Measured Field Data/Model Results for Congeners 84+92 and 99 in Water.	30
1.4.1	Summary of Lake Michigan Ice Cover Based Upon Assel (2003)	57
1.4.2	Description Wave Statistics for POM Calibration Years (1982-1983) and Study Years (1994-1995) Compared to the Period of Record for NOAA's Buoys in Northern and Southern Lake Michigan	64
1.5.1	Significant Dates in the History of PCBs in the Lake Michigan Basin	67
1.5.2	Monthly Composite Concentrations of Vapor Phase Total PCBs Measured in Samples Collected Around Lake Michigan From April 1994 to October 1995	69
1.5.3	Monthly Composite Concentrations of Total PCBs Measured in Precipitation Samples Collected Around Lake Michigan From April 1994 to October 1995	73
1.5.4	Monthly Composite Concentrations of Particulate Phase Total PCBs Measured in Samples Collected Around Lake Michigan From April 1994 to October 1995	75
1.5.5	Monthly Composite Concentrations of PCBs Measured in Dry Deposition	76
1.5.6	Concentrations of PCBs in 1994-1995 Lake Michigan Water (ng/L)	77
1.5.7	Concentrations of PCBs Measured in Tributaries	82
1.5.8	Comparison of PCB Concentrations in Samples Collected From Tributaries in 1994-1995 With Those in Samples Collected From Tributaries in 1980-1983	84
1.5.9	Concentrations of Total PCBs in Lake Michigan Surficial Sediment (ng/g)	84
1.5.10	Physical Parameters Associated With LMMBP Cores	86

1.5.11	Mean Concentrations of PCBs Measured in the 1994-1995 Lake Michigan Food Web	89
1.6.1	Comparison of Congeners Available for Analysis in All LMMBP Media	95
1.7.1	Significant Dates in the History of PCBs in the Lake Michigan Basin	111
1.7.2	Sedimentary Zones of Lake Michigan	115
2.3.1	Nutrient State Variables	126
2.4.1	1994-1995 Monthly Atmospheric Total Phosphorus Loads	140
2.4.2	Tributary Total Phosphorus Loads (kg/year)	141
2.4.3	Sediment Masses, Fluxes, and Loads	142
2.4.4	The LMMBP Sampling Cruises	142
2.4.5	The LMMBP Open Lake Nutrient Data Summary Statistics	144
2.4.6	Relationship of Field Measurements and Model State Variables	152
2.4.7	Important LM3 Model Coefficients	153
2.5.1	Coefficients Used in the LM3 Model (Units Correspond to Required LM3 Model Output)	162
2.5.2	Summary of Statistical Results of the Calibration	165
2.7.1	Final Eutrophication Scenario Results	179
3.3.1	MICHTOX Segment Geometry	188
3.3.2	Model Parameters and Coefficients	189
3.3.3	Cruise and Segment-Specific Average Dissolved Total PCB Concentrations (ng/L)	190
3.3.4	Cruise and Segment-Specific Average Particulate Total PCB Concentrations (ng/L)	190
3.3.5	Segment-Specific Average Surficial Sediment Total PCB Concentrations (ng/g)	190
3.4.1	Average Total PCB Concentrations in Fish in the Saugatuck Biota Zone	203
3.4.2	Average Total PCB Concentrations in Fish in the Sheboygan Reef Biota Zone	204
3.4.3	Average Total PCB Concentrations in Fish in the Sturgeon Bay Biota Zone	204
3.4.4	MICHTOX Food Chain Age- and Species-Specific Weight, Growth Rate, and Lipid Concentrations	205

3.4.5	MICHTOX Food Chain Model Parameters and Coefficients	206
A3.4.1	Comparison of the LMMBP Lake Trout to MDEQ Lake Superior Lake Trout	213
4.3.1	Geometry Data for Water Column Segments and Lake Michigan (Total)	229
4.3.2	Initial Geometry Data for Surficial Sediment Segments and Surficial Sediment Layer (Total)	230
4.3.3	Processes Considered in Organic Carbon Sorbent Dynamics Constructed for the LM2-Toxic	233
4.4.1	Average Annual Flows of the 10 Monitored Tributaries	249
4.4.2	Monthly Average Flows Across the Straits of Mackinac	251
4.4.3	Initial Temperatures in Water Column Segments for the Thermal Balance Model	251
4.4.4	Cruise-Segment Mean Temperatures for the LMMBP Period	252
4.4.5	The LMMBP Sampling Cruises	255
4.4.6	Initial Chloride Concentrations in Water Column Segments for the Chloride Model	255
4.4.7	Cruise-Segment Mean Chloride Concentrations for the LMMBP Period	256
4.4.8	Annual Average Organic Carbon Loads From 11 Monitored Tributaries to Lake Michigan During the LMMBP	259
4.4.9	Annual Average Organic Carbon Loads From 18 Unmonitored Tributaries to Lake Michigan During the LMMBP	259
4.4.10	Annual Average Organic Carbon Internal Loads Generated From the LM3-Eutro for Lake Michigan During the LMMBP	260
4.4.11	Initial Concentrations of Organic Carbon Sorbents in Water Column Segments for the LM2-Toxic	261
4.4.12	Cruise-Segment Mean Concentrations of DOC (mg/L) for the LMMBP Period	262
4.4.13	Cruise-Segment Mean Concentrations of BIC (mg/L) for the LMMBP Period	263
4.4.14	Cruise-Segment Mean Concentrations of PDC (mg/L) for the LMMBP Period	264
4.4.15	Concentration of Organic Carbon Sorbents in Surficial Sediments for the LM2-Toxic	267
4.4.16	Organic Carbon Sorbent Biotransformation Parameters Specified for the LM2-Toxic	268
4.4.17	Segment-Specific Settling Rates (m/d) for Organic Carbon Sorbents (BIC and PDC) Specified for the LM2-Toxic	269

4.4.18	Segment-Specific Effective PDC Concentrations (C_w) Used in the Steady-State Resuspension Calculation Based on the LMMBP Data	270
4.4.19	Segment-Specific Sediment Accumulation Rates (v_b) and Thickness of Mixing Layer (z) Used in the Steady-State Resuspension Calculation	270
4.4.20	Segment-Specific Critical Wave Heights (W_{cr}) and Empirical Wave Coefficients (α) Used in the Wave-Induced Resuspension Calculation Based on the LMMBP Data	271
4.4.21	List of PCB State Variables Modeled in the LM2-Toxic	272
4.4.22	Annual Average Σ PCB Loads From 11 Monitored and 18 Unmonitored Tributaries to Lake Michigan During the LMMBP	274
4.4.23	Annual Average Σ PCB Atmospheric Dry and Wet Loads in the 10 Surface Water Column Segments of Lake Michigan During the LMMBP	274
4.4.24	Annual Average Boundary Conditions of Σ PCB Vapor Phase Concentrations for Lake Michigan During the LMMBP	276
4.4.25	Initial Concentrations of Σ PCBs in Water Column Segments for Lake Michigan	278
4.4.26	Cruise-Segment Mean Concentration of Σ PCBs (ng/L) for the LMMBP Period	279
4.4.27	Initial Concentrations of Σ PCBs in Sediment Segments for Lake Michigan	280
4.4.28	Final Partition Coefficients for the LMMBP Selected PCBs Used in the LM2-Toxic	282
4.4.29	Values of Parameters Used for Air-Water Exchange in the LM2-Toxic for the LMMBP Selected PCB Congeners	283
4.5.1	Results of the Regression Between the LM2-Toxic Calibration Results and the Cruise Mean Data for the LMMBP Selected PCB Congeners	314
4.5.2	Results of the LM2-Toxic Mass Balance Checking for a 62-Year Simulation of an Assumed Conservative Tracer	315
4.5.3	Comparison Between the LMMBP Field-Generated and the LM2-Toxic-Generated Sediment Accumulation Rates (cm/year)	320
4.5.4	Available Historical Water Column Total PCB Concentrations for Lake Michigan	325
4.5.5	Sediment PCB Concentration Vertical Profiles Analyzed for Three Sediment Box Cores Taken During the LMMBP	326
4.5.6	Available Inventories of PCBs in Lake Michigan Sediments	327
4.5.7	Calculations in PCB Mass Budget Checking for the LM2-Toxic PCB Hindcast	332

4.6.1	Regression Equations Used for Converting ΣPCBs to Total PCBs for the LM2-Toxic Results	431
4.6.2	Results of Total PCB Mass Budget Analysis for Lake Michigan and Green Bay	434
4.6.3	Mean and Medium Particulate PCBs/Organic Carbon and Field Data and Scaling Factor for Hypolimnetic Level 2, Segments 21, 30, and 37, and for Saugatuck Biota Box Hypolimnion	442
4.7.1	Annual Average Concentrations of Water Column Carbon Solids and Annual Average Change in Percentage for Water Column Carbon Solids Concentrations Resulting From the LM2-Toxic Model Runs for Both the Short-Term (1994-1995) and the Long-Term (1994-2055) Simulations with 50% Increase and 50% Decrease of the LM3-Eutro Produced Primary Production	447
4.7.2	PCB ₂₈₊₃₁ Mass Fluxes and Inventories for Lake Michigan System Results From the LM2-Toxic Sensitivity Analysis on Primary Production for the Short-Term (Two-Year Period: 1994-1995) Simulations	448
4.7.3	PCB ₂₈₊₃₁ Mass Fluxes and Inventories for Lake Michigan System Results From the LM2-Toxic Sensitivity Analysis on Primary Production for the Last Two Years of the Long-Term (62-Year Period: 1994-2055) Simulations	449
4.7.4	PCB ₂₈₊₃₁ Average Inventories of Water Column and Surficial Sediment Results From the LM2-Toxic Simulations for the Primary Production Sensitivity Analysis, and Changes in Percentage for These Inventories Compared to the Inventories From the Original Base Runs	451
5.4.1	Targeted PCB Congeners and Their K _{ow}	466
5.4.2a	Annual Dietary Composition of Lake Trout at Saugatuck (1994-1995)	469
5.4.2b	Annual Dietary Composition of Lake Trout at Sheboygan Reef (1994-1995)	470
5.4.2c	Annual Dietary Composition of Lake Trout at Sturgeon Bay (1994-1995)	472
5.4.3	Dietary Composition of Alewife in Lake Michigan (1994-1995)	473
5.4.4	Dietary Composition of Bloater in Lake Michigan (1994-1995)	474
5.4.5	Dietary Composition of Rainbow Smelt in Lake Michigan (1994-1995)	474
5.4.6	Dietary Composition of Slimy Sculpin in Lake Michigan (1994-1995)	474
5.4.7	Dietary Composition of Deepwater Sculpin in Lake Michigan (1994-1995)	475
5.4.8	Dietary Composition of Coho Salmon in Lake Michigan (1994-1995)	475
5.4.9a	Average Weight-Age Relationships for Lake Trout in Lake Michigan (1994-1995)	477

5.4.9b	Average Weight-Age Relationships for Coho Salmon in Lake Michigan (1994-1995)	477
5.4.9c	Average Weight-Age Relationships of Forage Fish in Lake Michigan (1994-1995)	478
5.4.9d	Estimated Weight-Age Relationships of <i>Mysis</i> in Lake Michigan	478
5.4.10a	Average Lipid and Protein Fractions (%) of Lake Trout in Lake Michigan (1994-1995)	478
5.4.10b	Average Lipid and Protein Fractions (%) of Coho Salmon in Lake Michigan (1994-1995)	479
5.4.10c	Average Lipid and Protein Fractions (%) of Alewife in Lake Michigan (1994-1995)	479
5.4.10d	Average Lipid and Protein Fractions (%) of Bloater in Lake Michigan (1994-1995)	480
5.4.10e	Average Lipid and Protein Fractions (%) of Rainbow Smelt in Lake Michigan (1994-1995)	480
5.4.10f	Average Lipid and Protein Fractions (%) of Slimy Sculpin in Lake Michigan (1994-1995)	480
5.4.10g	Average Lipid and Protein Fractions (%) of Deepwater Sculpin in Lake Michigan (1994-1995)	481
5.4.10h	Average Lipid and Protein Fractions (%) of Zooplankton, <i>Mysis</i> , and <i>Diporeia</i> in Lake Michigan (1994-1995)	481
5.4.11	PCB Concentrations in Lake Michigan Water Column (1994-1995)	482
5.4.12	PCB Concentrations in Lake Michigan Surface Sediment (1994-1995)	484
5.4.13	Bioenergetic Parameters of Lake Michigan Fishes	487
5.5.1	Calibrated Parameter Values for <i>Diporeia</i> Submodel	494
5.5.2	Calibrated Model Parameters for PCBs in the Sturgeon Bay and Saugatuck Lake Trout Food Webs	494
5.5.3	Calibrated Model Parameters for PCBs in the Sheboygan Reef Lake Trout Food Web	494
5.5.4	Calibrated Model Parameters for PCBs in Lake Michigan Coho Salmon	495
7.1.1	Agenda – Lake Michigan Mass Balance PCB Modeling Peer Review	554
7.1.2	Significant Dates in the History of PCBs in the Lake Michigan Basin	562

Abbreviations

AOCs	Areas of Concern
AREAL	Atmospheric Research and Exposure Assessment Laboratory
BIC	Biotic carbon
BMC	Bayesian Monte Carlo
BNL	Benthic nepheloid layer
CCC	Criterion continuous concentration
CMC	Criterion maximum concentration
CPE	Catch per unit of effort
CTF	Contaminant transport and fate model
DDE	Dichlorodiphenyldichloroethylene
DEA	Deethylatrazine
DIA	Deisopropylatrazine
DIN	Dissolved inorganic nitrogen
DOC	Dissolved organic carbon
DON	Dissolved organic nitrogen
DOP	Dissolved organic phosphorus
DQO	Data quality objectives
DSi	Dissolved silica
EEGLE	Episodic Events-Great Lakes Experiments
EMP	Enhanced Monitoring Program
GLERL	Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory
GLNPO	Great Lakes National Program Office
GLWQA	Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement
GBMBP	Green Bay Mass Balance Project
HOC	Hydrophobic organic chemicals
IADN	Integrated Atmospheric Deposition Network
IDL	Instrument detection limit
IDW	Inverse distance weighted
LaMP	Lake-wide Management Plan
LLRFRB	Lake Lakes and Rivers Forecasting Research Branch
LLRS	Large Lakes Research Station
LMMBP	Lake Michigan Mass Balance Project
LOC	Labile organic carbon
LON	Labile organic nitrogen
LOP	Labile organic phosphorus
MCL	Maximum contaminant level
MDEQ	Michigan Department of Environmental Quality

MDL	Method detection limit
MED	Mid-Continent Ecology Division
MQO	Measurement quality objectives
NHEERL	National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
ORD	Office of Research and Development
PCBs	Polychlorinated biphenyls
PDC	Particulate detrital carbon
PI	Principal Investigator
POC	Particulate organic carbon
POM	Princeton Ocean Model
POP	Persistent organic pollutants
QA	Quality assurance
QAPP	Quality Assurance Project Plan
QC	Quality control
RAPs	Remedial Action Plans
RDMQ	Research Data Management and Quality Control System
RFS	Routine field sample
ROC	Refractory organic carbon
RON	Refractory organic nitrogen
ROP	Refractory organic phosphorus
SA	Available silica
SDA	Specific dynamic action
SDL	System detection limit
SRP	Soluble reactive phosphorus
SU	Biogenic silica
TKN	Total Kjeldahl nitrogen
TMDL	Total maximum daily load
USDOI	United States Department of Interior
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
VWA	Volume-weighted average

Acknowledgments

Special thanks to the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Great Lakes National Program Office for leadership, support, and collaboration on the Lake Michigan Mass Balance Project. The multiple efforts by the Principal Investigators for providing data, necessary for the modeling, are greatly appreciated. Thank you to David H. Miller, Kenneth R. Rygwelski, Timothy J. Feist, Xiaomi Zhang, and James P. Pauer for providing internal technical reviews of various parts of this document. Thanks to Kay Morrison for the graphic renditions and figures and to Debra L. Caudill for formatting and word processing. Finally, thanks to Robert B. Ambrose, Jr., Joel E. Baker, Ken G. Drouillard, Barry Lesht, and James L. Martin for serving on the peer review panel.

Executive Summary

The Lake Michigan Mass Balance Project (LMMBP) provided an opportunity to improve the quality of polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) mass balance models used to represent large, freshwater ecosystems. A rigorously quality-assured large supporting data set derived from samples collected during eight cruises in 1994-1995 was used to establish atmospheric and tributary loads, estimate initial conditions, perform model calibration and confirmation and, to a lesser extent, to assist in estimating a number of kinetic coefficients. A significant aspect of this modeling effort was modeling PCBs at a congener-level basis.

Lake Michigan is acted upon by a number of physical parameters that impact the hydrology, chemistry, and biology of the lake. For a lake the size of Lake Michigan, changes in these parameters can lead to significant changes, especially when models are used in long-term predictions to predict the outcome of various scenarios. The primary driving forces are wind, air temperature, and precipitation. These impact tributary flows, lake levels, waves, water circulation, water temperature, and ice cover. For the period of record, these driving forces vary from year-to-year. The period of 1982 to 1983 was used to calibrate the hydrodynamic models. For this period of time, hydrodynamic conditions were not at any extreme. This is also true for the period of 1994 and 1995 when the models were applied.

Major physical forcing functions were not extreme during the sampling period of 1994-1995 or the hydrodynamic model calibration period of 1982-1983. Precipitation was within the normal range for all years of modeling interest, resulting in lake levels and tributary flows that were within normal bounds.

Temperature will impact the eutrophication and contaminant modeling. Air temperature impacts how quickly the lake warms in any one year. Water temperature is critical to the timing of algae blooms, especially the spring diatom bloom. It also impacts the volatilization of contaminants. There appears to be a four-year cycle of quicker warming which exists within a trend of general warming of the lake. The trend of warming may be part of a longer term, undocumented cycle, or may be related to climate change.

Models developed at the United States Environmental Protection Agency's Large Lakes Research Station, including LM3-Eutro, MICHTOX, LM2-Toxic, and LM Food Chain, utilized results from a hydrodynamic model to describe the lake's physics and results from air and tributary models to provide loadings to the lake.

LM3-Eutro uses state-of-the-science eutrophication kinetics to simulate the interactions between plankton and nutrients. LM3-Eutro is a high-resolution (44,042 cells and 19 sigma layers) carbon based model that provides a highly resolved description of areas such as near and off shore zones, bays, river confluences, and the thermocline. Its nutrient variables include dissolved, labile particulate, and refractory particulate forms which provide a more realistic description of phytoplankton-nutrient interactions. Improvements were made to the light calculation by using a three-hour rather than 24-hour (one day) average estimate of solar radiation. The model is driven by the Princeton Ocean hydrodynamics Model which simulates water movements. LM3-Eutro

has 17 state variables, including a single zooplankton class, two phytoplankton classes, and several particulate and dissolved nutrient (including carbon) states.

The model was calibrated on the high-resolution (44,042 cells) Level 3 framework as well as the 41 segment Level 2 framework. The Level 2 calibration enabled us to visually observe known spatial and temporal trends such as the spring diatom bloom and phytoplankton concentration gradients between the epilimnion and hypolimnion. The Level 3 calibration was performed on a whole-lake basis. The 1994-1995 LMMBP field data were used to calibrate the model. The final calibration was chosen based on the best Level 3 calibration, but Level 2 output was visually inspected to ensure that expected phytoplankton and nutrients trends were reflected. Model confirmation was performed by comparing the model to limited total phosphorus data for 1998 and 2000 and to a historical model, MICH1, which was developed and calibrated in the 1970s and modified more recently. All comparisons were done on a whole-lake basis, and LM3-Eutro fits the 1998 and 2000 data well. LM3-Eutro and MICH1 compared surprisingly well, especially given the fact that they are based on very different frameworks, kinetics, and segmentation. Compared to field data and LM3-Eutro predicted, MICH1 underpredicted both total phosphorus concentrations. This was probably due to the fact that MICH1 does not have any phosphorus sediment recycling. Lower phosphorus values also cause MICH1 to under-predict chlorophyll *a* concentrations in the lake.

MICHTOX is a toxic chemical mass balance and food chain bioaccumulation model developed in the early 1990s. A Bayesian Monte Carlo uncertainty analysis demonstrated that MICHTOX predicted PCB concentrations should be within a factor of two measured data. During the early part of the LMMBP, MICHTOX was updated and used as a preliminary assessment tool of the LMMBP PCB data and to provide a screening-level analysis of the potential future trends in total PCB concentrations in Lake Michigan water, sediment, and fish under a variety of contaminant load scenarios. Unmonitored tributary inputs were added to the model and the applicability of MICHTOX for predicting Lake Michigan total PCB concentrations in water, sediment, and fish was reconfirmed. MICHTOX was applied using the previously developed parameterization and LMMBP data and forcing functions. The model fit to data was acceptable with no adjustments to the model parameters. The model also provided a comparison of an older, “off-the-shelf” model with the more complex models developed as part of the Lake Michigan Mass Balance Project (LMMBP). MICHTOX was run for seven scenarios to help evaluate the impacts on PCB trends caused by various loading sources and to evaluate loading scenarios. Results of the MICHTOX modeling indicate that atmospheric exchange is a dominant loss process of total PCBs in Lake Michigan, and that the reservoir of total PCBs in the sediment has a significant impact on the future trends in concentrations of total PCBs in lake trout.

LM2-Toxic is a sophisticated and state-of-the-art toxic chemical fate and transport model for Lake Michigan. It is a coupled mass balance of organic carbon solids and toxic chemical (PCBs) dynamics. Using the LMMBP generated field data, the organic carbon solids dynamics were first calibrated. This was followed by the independent calibration of PCB dynamics. The temporal variations of both biotic carbon (BIC) and particulate detrital carbon (PDC) resulted from an algal bloom in late spring and early summer. Primary production was the dominant organic carbon load to Lake Michigan. The eutrophication model (LM3-Eutro) generated primary production accounted for over 90 percent of the total particulate organic carbon load to the lake.

The main focus of this model is to address the relationship between sources of toxic chemicals and their concentrations in water and sediments of Lake Michigan and to provide the PCB exposure concentrations to the bioaccumulation model (LM2 Food Chain) to predict PCBs concentrations in lake trout tissue. LM2-Toxic is a revision of the USEPA supported WASP4 water quality modeling framework. It incorporates the organic carbon dynamics featured in GBTOX and the sediment transport scheme, a quasi-Lagrangian framework, used in the IPX. Both GBTOX and IPX were WASP4-type models and major components in the Green Bay Mass Balance Study modeling framework. Another important modification was the addition of updated air-water exchange formulations to the model.

The results at 5 x 5 km² grid generated by Princeton Ocean Model for the Great Lakes (POMGL) were linked to the transport fields for LM2-Toxic. Due to an affinity of PCBs for organic carbon, three organic carbon sorbents were simulated as state variables in LM2-Toxic. They were BIC, PDC and dissolved organic carbon (DOC). The model simulated 54 PCB congeners which accounted for 63% to 85% of the total PCB mass in various media for Lake Michigan. This was an enormous effort because individual congeners or co-eluting congeners were modeled as separate state variables in the mass balance, each with their own physical/chemical properties. Four phases were simulated in LM2-Toxic for the congeners. The four phases were dissolved, sorbed to PDC, sorbed to BIC, and bound to DOC.

To reduce uncertainties associated with water transport, settling and resuspension, and sedimentation, a thermal balance model, a chloride model, a long-term simulation using a ¹³⁷Cs and ^{239,240}Pu model, and a long-term organic carbon simulation using LM2-Toxic were developed and run for LM2-Toxic confirmation.

Air-water exchange of PCBs was the most important process for Lake Michigan. Net sediment resuspension was the second largest net source. Both the water column and the surficial sediment layer of the lake were not at steady-state during the LMMBP period. The model was also applied for forecasting the long-term responses (60-year simulation, starting on January 1, 1996) of the PCBs in Lake Michigan under various forcing functions and load reduction scenarios. The results indicate that the PCB mass in the surficial sediment is large and thus could support PCB concentrations in the water column for a very long time.

LM Food Chain is the food web bioaccumulation model developed for the LMMBP. The model established dynamic relationships between PCBs concentrations in the exposure environments and resulting PCBs levels in the lake trout food webs of Lake Michigan. The model was based upon available theory and data characterizing the bioaccumulation of toxic chemicals in fish and other aquatic organisms. Samples collected for the LMMBP were used to generate data on lake trout and coho salmon food webs in Lake Michigan and to facilitate refinement of model parameters to site-specific conditions for forty PCB congeners or co-eluters that represented toxic chemicals covering a wide range of hydrophobicity.

The food web model was calibrated with PCB data collected in 1994 and 1995 for lake trout food webs at Sturgeon Bay, Sheboygan Reef, and Saugatuck. The lake trout sub-populations in these three biota zones were believed to be appropriate representations of lake trout in Lake Michigan. Model calibration was also performed for a lake-wide coho salmon food web. During the model calibration, model parameters were refined to achieve an adequate agreement between model calculations and observed PCB data for a food web. The focus of model calibration was not limited to top predators or to toxics with a certain hydrophobicity. The model parameters were systematically optimized for all species at various trophic levels and for PCB congeners of a wide range of hydrophobicity. Extra care was taken to ensure the refined parameter values were consistent with the hydrophobicity of individual PCB congeners and with the trophic position of individual species. Satisfactory calibration results were achieved for the lake trout food webs at Sturgeon Bay and Saugatuck. The model parameters calibrated with data from the Sturgeon Bay food webs were independently tested and validated with data from the Saugatuck food web, and *vice versa*.

The availability of a complete account of observed data for each food web made this model calibration probably the most thorough process among similar efforts. Although PCB concentrations in lake trout or coho salmon were the endpoint of the model computation and the focus of most model applications, the food web model with parameters “fine-tuned” for species at all trophic levels can be used to target any desirable species in the food web with a high degree of confidence. Also, the food web model can be used to model toxics with various hydrophobicities. No food web model intended to simulate as many toxic chemicals with diverse hydrophobicity has been previously developed.

The validated food web model was applied to the lake trout food webs at Sturgeon Bay and Saugatuck and inferred for the southeastern and northwestern regions of the lake to predict future PCB concentrations. Several model simulations were performed to predict the expected changes in future lake trout PCB concentrations in response to different exposure scenarios. Hypothetical long-term PCB exposure scenarios in the post-1994/1995 period for the food webs at the Sturgeon Bay and Saugatuck biota zones were generated by the water quality model LM2-Toxic. For each lake trout food web, the resulting concentrations of individual PCB congeners in fish were predicted. Similar model predictions were observed for these two biota zones under each reduction scenario. For the continued fast recovery scenario, current simulations indicate that the total PCB concentrations in adult lake trout (5.5 years old) were expected to reach the target level of 0.075 ppm in 2030 for the Saugatuck biota zone, 2033 for southeastern Lake Michigan, 2036 for northwestern Lake Michigan, and 2036 for the Sturgeon Bay biota zone.